DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 715 SP 032 250

AUTHOR Friedman, Malcolm
TITLE Collaboratives--Universities and Schools as Partners in Staff Development.
PUB DATE Feb 90
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Eastern Educational Research Association Conference (Clearwater, FL, February 6, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Cooperative Programs; *Degrees (Academic); Elementary Secondary Education; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS Brooklyn Community School District 13 NY; Long Island University NY

ABSTRACT

Some basic considerations undergird partnerships between schools and colleges undertaken to work on problems of mutual concern that may be difficult to solve individually. Studies have indicated that successful collaboratives require the existence of certain special conditions and the surmounting of certain barriers. Research studies have pointed to factors that facilitate and maintain collaboration. Five major factors are considered important for collaborative development: (1) assessment of needs, (2) decision making, (3) willingness to reach out, (4) apperceptive base, and (5) flexibility. Brief descriptions are given of 10 major partnership projects undertaken between 1984 and 1989; a more detailed description is given of a model collaborative entered into by an urban school district and a university in New York City. The purpose of the partnership was to provide a graduate study program for inner-city elementary school teachers seeking a master of science degree. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED318715

LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY
Brooklyn Campus

COLLABORATIVES: UNIVERSITIES AND SCHOOLS AS PARTNERS IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT

by

Malcolm Friedman Ph.D.
Long Island University
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Paper presented at the
Eastern Educational Research Association Conference

Clearwater Florida
February, 1990

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Friedman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

SP 032 250

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Collaboration: An Overview	1
2. Collaborative Concerns	2
2.1 Assessment of Need	2
2.2 Decision Making	3
2.3 Willingness to Reach Out	3
2.4 Apperceptive Base	4
2.5 Flexibility	4
3. Collaborative Menu	5
4. Sample Collaborative Project: Project Linkage.	6
4.1 Background	6
4.2 Description of Institutions	7
4.3 Project Goals	8
4.4 Project Design	8
4.5 Course Sequence	9
4.6 Evaluation	11
5. Collaborative Cautions	13
References	14

1. Collaboration: An Overview

The literature of the 1980's is replete with articles describing partnerships, collaborative relationships and cooperative ventures involving various constituencies to include school/business, school/institutions of higher education, school/foundations and school/governmental agencies. The premise put forth is that collaboratives serve to enhance the mission of the schools in that cooperative ventures draw upon a wide variety of resources available from non-school sources which impact positively upon what schools do. Although there is historic precedent for collaboration, there appears to be a new urgency. (Lieberman, 1986, Maeroff, 1983). Colleges and school educators are showing an interest in each other. Conferences, conversations and collaborative projects are cropping up from coast to coast. (Maeroff, 1983).

The final report of the Ford Foundation (1988) on Urban School-University Collaboration uses as its definition of collaboratives "the joint undertaking of two or more independent bodies involved in education which work on problems of mutual concern that may be difficult to solve individually. (Pine & Keone, 1986)." The term collaboration is used because of the proactive, co-equal problem solving image it conveys. For purposes of this paper, the definition cited above will be utilized.

While schools of education and public schools have traditionally interfaced in regard to student teacher programs, student observer programs, or joint clinical endeavors, the movement towards other meaningful relationships has accelerated during the last decade (Mickelson et al, 1988) and stems from a renewed interest in collaboratives in response to reports such as A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education,1983). In essence, there has been a search to uncover relationship patterns which are non-traditional and are designed to impact upon school performance.

A linkage is evident between the educational reform movement and emerging collaborative ventures which are an outgrowth of this movement. Two significant reports spearheading reform are A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy) and Tomorrow's Teachers (A Report of the Holmes Group). The Holmes Group states:

> "Our goals also lead us out, from the universities in which intending teachers study, to the schools in which they must practice. We have become convinced that university officials and professors must join with schools, and with the teacher

organizations and state and local school governments that shape the schools, to change the teaching profession. Schools no less than universities are places in which teachers learn." (Holmes Group, 1986).

Holmes further indicates, as an important goal, the connection of higher education institutions to schools. In addition, it is stated that if university faculties are to become more expert educators of teachers, they must make use of expert teachers in the education of teachers.

The Carnegie Commission points out that "real reform cannot be accomplished despite teachers. It will only come with their active participation (Carnegie, 1986.)"

Reviewing the statements above, we are inclined to re-think traditional school/university relationships and reflect upon how innovative school/university collaboratives can reshape American education. This paper will outline basic considerations that undergird partnerships, provide a collaborative "menu" and describe a model collaborative entered into by an urban school district and university in New York City.

2. Collaborative Concerns

A report of the Chancellor's Steering Committee on University-School Collaborative Projects (New York City Schools, 1989) indicates that successful collaboratives require the existence of certain "special" conditions and the surmounting of certain "barriers." Research studies (Ford Foundation, 1988) point to factors which facilitate and maintain collaboration. In the development of the collaborative concerns discussed below, these factors and the author's experience in collaborative development were utilized. The five concerns to be considered include:

1. Assessment of Need
2. Decision Making
3. Willingness to Reach Out
4. Apperceptive Base
5. Flexibility

These are discussed in the context of program development as an urban university establishes partnerships with local education agencies.

2.1 Assessment of Need

It is simplistic to say "let's collaborate" without exploratory steps to assess areas of mutual concern

within the local school district and university. For example, university personnel charged with the responsibility of partnership development need to be attuned to current interest or needs in the educational community. Questions that may be asked include:

> What are current curricular concerns in the schools (i.e. multicultural education, bilingual education, family living, science and mathematics)?
>
> Is there an urgent staff development need in regard to courses for new and inexperienced pedagogical personnel?
>
> Is the local education agency looking for assistance in locating and training bilingual personnel?
>
> Are the schools searching for partnerships in the development of grants from private and federal sources?
>
> Is the university interested in field testing a new curriculum?

Experience in collaborative building indicates that the more specific the focus the greater the likelihood there is of success.

2.2 Decision Making

While there is need for careful planning of each collaborative effort, the effectiveness of the partnership depends upon the commitment of both parties to "action" rather than "reflection." Educators in the public sector work in an environment where they are constantly "under the gun." Indeed, there is always an expectation of immediate change, for remediation to have been started "yesterday." Recognizing that educators live with constraints of time, a university involved in collaboratives needs to determine the administrative decision-making layers and empower the partnership developer to make decisions in a timely fashion. Simply put, nothing will turn off the practicing educator more than administrative contemplation and bureaucratic roadblocks.

2.3 Willingness to Reach Out

For collaboratives to succeed, the parties must be able to put aside old concepts of distrust and accept the premise that school and university are partners in

helping schools succeed. The university needs to adopt the position that not all knowledge and wisdom is housed within the geographical limits which define the campus. University administration must be willing to accept the viability of external programs, in essence permitting courses to be given at sites and at times convenient for school staff.

School districts, in turn, should be willing to permit university faculty to move easily into schools, to try out new curriculum, to speak to faculty and to serve a consultative function.

2.4 Apperceptive Base

Past relationships with school districts and centralized offices form the building blocks for collaboratives. It is easier to begin programs where there has been previous work done and where school and university personnel have come together. Partnerships are further enhanced if the university has someone on staff who has a track record of working with schools. In the best possible scenario a university person who has worked within the public school sectors can assist in building the bridge. So much that we do depends upon past professional and personal relationships.

2.5 Flexibility

University faculty need to be willing to enter into "curriculum negotiation" when planning collaborative efforts. Curriculum personnel in school districts often request that university course content reflects current priorities in schools. For example, if a district is utilizing the effective schools model, then a request may come that a university research course reflect research in effective schools.

Collaborative projects call for faculty assigned to courses from the university as well as schools. While the university generally provides the theoretical base for good practice, assigning practitioners as adjunct professors provides for a "theory into practice" module.

University faculty need to feel comfortable with an organizational pattern that permits qualified practitioners to accept adjunct appointments. Collaboratives are also strengthened when full-time university faculty accept teaching assignments at off-campus sites. In addition, flexible time patterns need to be explored as for example, weekend courses or longer course sessions.

3. Collaborative Menu

A review of the literature indicates a wide range of projects that may be identified as collaborative ventures, some involving entire school systems (Boston Compact). Others are small out-reach efforts on the part of individual professors in schools of education. The projects below are a sample of Long Island University, Brooklyn Campus outreach over the past five years. Space permits only a limited sampling and brief description of some of the thirty or more major partnership projects undertaken during the period 1984-1989.

Long Island Linkage - This is a consortium of Brooklyn superintendents (11) formed to discuss the range of collaborative projects available and to plan for implementation.

City-As-School, Brooklyn Campus - Long Island University, Brooklyn Campus houses an alternative high school, City-As-School. Students serve in job placements at the university.

Introduction to the College Experience - Junior high school students visit college campus with teachers. Participation with college students in class sessions and an opportunity to meet with Honors Program students is part of this effort.

Graduate Special Education Extension Program - The university offers graduate courses in over 30 off-campus sites designed for staff development for newly-assigned and inexperienced teachers.

Magnet School Grant - This represents the development with a New York City School district of a grant proposal to create a junior high school magnet school with special curriculum emphasis on mathematics and science. Activities include on-campus studies for children.

Summer Pre-Service Special Education Institute- This is a twelve-credit summer program in special education studies designed to prepare persons for service as teachers of special education. It was developed in cooperation with the central Board of Education, New York City.

Foreign Language Teaching Grant - Staff development in selected school districts is planned designed to upgrade foreign language

Campus Conferences - School of Education co-sponsored conferences. Approximately 10 each year are planned. Activities bring on campus between 100 - 1,000 educators for each conference. Areas include special education, mathematics supportive services, social studies, communication arts and bilingual leadership.

Psychologist-In-Training Program - Joint efforts with the New York City Board of Education identify persons for the critical shortage area of school psychologist. College training cooperative internships are provided.

Master's Degree Program in Elementary Education (On-Site) - This program is designed to offer an M.S. in Elementary Education in a specific school district with large numbers of newly-assigned and inexperienced staff. Curriculum and staffing is agreed upon cooperatively. A detailed description of this project follows below.

4. Sample Collaborative Project: Project Linkage - A Master's Degree in Elementary Education for Inner-City Teachers

4.1 Background

During the Fall, 1985 preliminary meetings were held at Long Island University to discuss the possibility of offering a Master of Science in Elementary Education at an off-campus site in Community School District 13, Brooklyn. A personnel review conducted in October, 1985 in the district indicated that there were approximately 145 newly-assigned teachers. In addition, numerous teachers were relatively new, working as temporary per diem substitutes on long-term assignment.

An analysis of this information revealed a need for a program of graduate study for those teachers. Long Island University had previously indicated a commitment to work with Community School District 13 on programs of mutual benefit for both the university and the school district. The plan was to offer a customized program of teacher education at the graduate level as a collaborative undertaking between the school district and the university. An underlying premise was that the curriculum would meet the needs of working educators and would reinforce the philosophy, goals and objectives of Community School District 13.

4.2 Description of Institutions

Long Island University

The Brooklyn Campus of Long Island University is an urban complex in the heart of downtown Brooklyn. The faculty seeks to provide a well-rounded education for inner-city youth and in-service teachers who, in most instances, must work while pursuing their education. The needs of the urban, inner-city students are unique and require an institution with leadership and vision about their place in the world. Many urban youth come to Long Island University seeking careers in teaching.

The specific mission of the School of Education is to prepare excellent teachers for the schools in the New York City area. Most of our undergraduate students are from the local schools and our graduate students are employed in the 13 districts that surround the University as well as in districts far from our campus. We work closely with the districts to discern personnel needs and services that will assist them in teaching the children of New York City.

Community School District 13, Brooklyn

This district is representative of most urban school districts. Approximately 80% of the school population is black, another 18% is Hispanic, and not more than 2% is white. The district provides an education program for approximately 15,500 pupils in grades kindergarten through nine. There are 18 elementary schools, 17 of which qualify for Chapter 1 funds.

Rogers and Chung (1983) characterized Community School District 13 as one of the most effective districts in New York City. Between 1974 and 1985,the percentage of students in the district who were reading on or above grade level was22.1 in 1974; 22.9 in 1975; 36.8 in 1976; 36.0 in 1977; 31.7 in 1978; 29.8 in 1979; 41.0 in 1980; 46.6 in 1981; 47.5 in 1982; 56.7 in 1983; 55.5 in 1984; and 58.9 in 1985. Improvements were reflected in mathematics as well. Between 1981 and 1985, the percentage of students in the district that scored on or above grade-level on the city-wide mathematics test was 43.9 in 1981; 50.3 in 1982; 56.3 in 1983; 61.5 in 1984 and 61.6 in 1985. (The city-wide mathematics test was not administered to all grades prior to 1981.)

4.3 Project Goals

Consultation with school district staff resulted in the establishment of the following project goals:

To create a linkage between a uiversity School of Education located in an urban center and a public school district.

To provide a model, based upon the collaborative effort, which can be adapted by other universities and school systems throughout the United States.

To develop a sense of commitment to the profession and the school district as a consequence of active participation in the program.

To enhance teachers' sense of power as a result of participating in the development of a Master's Program.

To combat teacher isolation by providing a setting where teachers can share positive experience and learn how to overcome classroom related problems.

4.4 Project Design

The Director of Elementary Curriculum and Instruction, District 13, and the Assistant Dean School of Education, Long Island University, reviewed the present curriculum for the M.S. in Education Program in Early Childhood and Elementary Education.

A tentative schedule of courses to be offered (Fall, 1986-Spring 1988) was developed. The program includes six credits in special education as required by the New York City Board of Education and New York State Department of Education.

Course materials to include outlines, requirements, bibliographies and other materials would be developed as a collaborative effort. Participants in this collaboration were be the Director of Elementary Curriculum for District 13, the Assistant Dean of Long Island University, the course instructors and other university staff.

A specific sequence of courses was designed to insure that participants moved through he program in a sequential manner.

Course work would be followed by intervisitation opportunities for participants so that teachers would have an opportunity to view ideas in practice and would feel less isolated.

Classes would be conducted off-campus, in District 13 and on campus, at times convenient for teacher participants. Course instructors would be selected by university and district personnel. These instructors would be regular faculty members in the School of Education of Long Island University and selected adjunct personnel from Community School District 13 and Central Board of Education offices.

Participants would move as a cohort through the program and would be expected to make a commitment to complete the program and teach in District 13.

District and university staff would meet on a continual basis to evaluate and modify program curriculum, as necessary. Input would be solicited from project participants.

4.5 Course Sequence

It was indicated, in the section 4.4 of this paper, that participants would move as a cohort through the program. The students would not be able to select courses at random. The rationale for this approach was based on the desire to provide students with an apperceptive base of knowledge which would help them in succeeding courses. For example, since each course would focus on recent research in the field, it was felt that Education 601-Analyzing Educational Research would be a good beginning course since it would assist participants in the analysis of research in content courses that would follow. The sequence of courses is listed below:

District 13/Long Island University

M.S. - Elementary Education

Course Sequence

Fall, 1986 (6 cr.)

EDU 601 - Analyzing Educational Research (3 cr.)

EDU 517 - Child Development (3 cr.)

Summer, 1987 (8 cr.)

EDU 606 - Contemporary Philosophies of Education (3 cr.)

EDU 663 - The Exceptional Child: An Overview (3 cr.)

EDU 626c - Methods and Materials of Teaching Social Studies (2 cr.)

Spring, 1987 (6 cr.)

EDU 621 - Learning in an Urban Setting (3 cr.)

EDU 626a - Methods and Materials of Teaching Reading (3 cr.)

Fall, 1987 (7 cr.)

EDU 626b - Methods and Materials of Teaching Mathematics (3 cr.)

EDU 626d - Methods and Materials of Teaching Science (2 cr.)

EDU 626e - Using Computers to Teach (2 crs.)

Spring, 1988 (9 cr.)

EDU 640 - Educational Evaluation (3 cr.)

EDU 660 - Mainstreaming Inner-City Handicapped Youngsters (3 cr.)

EDU 520 - Reading and Critical Thinking (3 cr.)

It should be noted that special programming provision was made for the exceptional student who could not complete the sequence in order or required additional time.

4.6 Evaluation

During the second year of the project (Fall, 1987) an inventory instrument was administered to program participants. The total responses numbered twenty and results are summarized below:

Age

The age range of respondents was between 20 and 55 years.

Years in Service

The average number of years in service for the group was 8.5. 9 participants had 0-5 years, 3 had 6-10 years, 1 had 11-15 years, and 1 had 16 or more years in service as a teacher.

Grades Taught

Primarily, for this group of respondents, the grades taught were early childhood/elementary grades; with the greatest percentage of respondents (30%) teaching at the 3rd grade level. Kindergarten had 10% of respondents, 1st grade- 20%; 2nd grade- 5%, 4th grade 5%, 5th grade - 5%, and 6th grade- 20%.

Tenure and License

Of the respondents, 35% were fully tenured teachers. Within the group, 100% were licensed by New York City - 70% held regular licenses and 30% held per-diem licenses.

Overall Program Satisfaction

According to this instrument, 35% of respondents were satisfied and 65% were somewhat satisfied with courses taken in the program. No respondent indicated dissatisfaction.

Confidence Scale

Within the evaluation, participants were asked to quantitatively rate their confidence levels in regard to their ability to do graduate work. They were also asked to respond concerning their confidence regarding teaching ability as compared to their level of confidence at the start of the program.

55% of the respondents felt that the program enhanced their ability to do graduate work. 75% noted that they felt more confident in their teaching performance as a result of program participation.

Course Value

The respondents were asked to rate the value of the courses which emphasized methods. 50% responded that the courses were worthwhile and 49% felt that the courses were somewhat worthwhile for them as classroom teachers. Only one respondent indicated that one course was not worthwhile.

Professional Growth

When asked, if as a result of participating in the program, respondents grew professionally, 75% of the participants responded that they had indeed grown professionally.

Respondents were asked to rate various aspects of each course according to criteria listed below. The chart indicates their responses.

	Excellent	Very Good	Average	Below
Level of Course Work	35%	35%	30%	
Value of Courses for Teachers	40%	35%	25%	
Significance for Intellectual Growth	40%	35%	25%	
Validity of Course as Part of a Masters Program	45%	35%	20%	

It should be noted that no respondent rated any criterion at the below average level.

The results gathered from the administration of the inventory instrument provided some interesting conclusions in regard to how program participants view the collaborative project. Of particular interest is that most respondents indicated:

.Overall program satisfaction

.Increased confidence in their ability to do graduate work

.Increased confidence in their ability to perform as teachers

.That course work improved their performance as teachers

While the sample is small, it is encouraging to note the positive nature of the participants responses.

5. Collaborative Cautions

Collaborations with local educational agencies are exciting ventures. They bring renewed vitality to the university community. However, certain cautions should be pointed out to those who embark on partnerships.

.Courses offered at off-site locations should contain content at the graduate level. They cannot be "watered down" in-service offerings.

.Standards for staffing should be maintained to insure that students are receiving quality instruction from qualified faculty

.Course schedules should reflect the same student contact hours as on-campus.

.Library facilities should be provided, on campus, to insure that students are given adequate research sources.

.Provision should be made for the exceptional student who cannot complete the course sequence in order.

.Visitation and review to include ongoing evaluation should be built into the program

The success of any collaborative effort is dependent upon the sense of commitment of the collaborators. This, in summary, is the most important factor to be considered by potential collaborators.

REFERENCES

A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. The Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, Carnegie Forum on Education, 1986.

Bush, Robert N. Toward a Collaborative Future. Teacher Education Quarterly; 13, 47-50, WIN 1986.

Collaboration between Schools and Colleges. Teacher Education and Practice; 3, 23-24, Spr-Sum 1986.

De Bevoise, Wynn. Collaboration: Some Principles of Bridgework. Educational Leadership; 43, 9-12, Feb 1986 (Reprint:UMI).

Galen, Helen L., Kardon, Barbara H. Model for Teacher Education. Action in Teacher Education; 8, 45-50, Sum 1986 (Reprint:UMI).

Gibson, Margaret A. Collaborative Educational Ethnography: Problems and Profits. Anthology and Education; 16, 124-48, Sum 1985.

Gilman, Francie. Cooperative Ventures in Teacher Education. Journal of Teacher Education; 35, 24-26, Nov-Dec 1984.

Hord, S.M. A synthesis of research on organizational collaboration. Educational Leadership, 43, 22-26, 1986.

Lieberman, A. Collaborative research: Working with, not working on... Educational Leadership; 43(5), 28-32, 1986.

Lieberman, A. Collaborative work. Educational Leadership; 43(5), 4-8, 1986.

Maeroff, G.I. School and college: Partnerships in education. Special report. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 238 325).

Mickelson, Douglas J. et al. Urban School - University Collaboration: A Final Report to the Ford Foundation, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 1988.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. A Report to the Nation and the Secretary of Education, United States Department of Education. Washington, D.C.: The Commission, 1983.

Parish, Ralph; And Others. We Do Not Make Change: School-University Collaboration. Metropolitan Education; 44-55, 1987.

Pine, Gerald J.: Keane, William G.
"Tearing Down the Wall: collaboration among Educational Institutes" Spectrum: 4, 27-32, 1986

Selberg, Edith M.: Peterson, Kenneth.
"Collaborative Practices Between School Districts and A College in Retraining Teachers for Quality Science Education"
Science Education: 115-123, Apr/Jun 1971

Tommorow's Teachers or a Report of the Homes Group, 1986

Toward a New Educational Partnership, Report of the Chancellor's Steering Committee or University - School Collaboratives - Board of Education, City of New York, 1989

Trubowitz, S. (1986) Stages in the Development of School-College Collaboration. Education Leadership, 43 (5), 18-21

Vivian, James R.
Issues in Establishing and Developing and Educational Collaborative; The Yale-New Haven Experience"
Education and Urban Society; 19 p 59-76 Nov 1986 (Special Issue on Collaboration)

Wu, P.C.
Research on Collaboration: Why it Works in Some Places and Not Others: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of States on Inservice Education. Kentucky, Nov 1986